

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
DISTRICT OF NEVADA

STEVEN J. BANK,

Plaintiff,

vs.

4 UNKNOWN AGENTS OF THE GENERAL
SERVICES ADMINISTRATION,

Defendant.

Case No. 2:13-cv-01044-JAD-PAL

REPORT OF FINDINGS AND
RECOMMENDATION

Plaintiff Steven J. Bank is proceeding in this action pro se, and on June 11, 2013, he filed an Application to Proceed In Forma Pauperis (Dkt. #1). The court reviewed Plaintiff's Application and found that it was not the court's standard application and did not contain all of the information required for the court to determine whether Plaintiff qualifies to proceed in forma pauperis. Accordingly, the court denied the Application without prejudice and directed Plaintiff to submit a new application. Plaintiff was warned that failure to comply could result in a recommendation to the district judge that this case be dismissed. Plaintiff has not submitted a new application or requested additional time in which to comply.

Accordingly,

IT IS ORDERED that the Clerk of Court file the Complaint.

IT IS RECOMMENDED that the Complaint be DISMISSED and this case be CLOSED.

Dated this 19th day of August, 2013.


 PEGGY A. LEEN
 UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE

NOTICE

These findings and recommendations are submitted to the United States District Judge assigned to the case, pursuant to the provisions of 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1). Within fourteen days after being served with these findings and recommendations, any party may file written objections with the court. Pursuant to Local Rule of Practice (LR) IB 3-2(a), any party wishing to object to the findings and recommendations of a magistrate judge shall file and serve *specific written objections* together with points and authorities in support of those objections, within fourteen days of the date of service of the findings and recommendations. The document should be captioned “Objections to Magistrate Judge’s Findings and Recommendations.” The parties are advised that failure to file objections within the specified time may waive the right to appeal the District Court’s Order. *Martinez v. Ylst*, 951 F.2d 1153 (9th Cir. 1991). The points and authorities filed in support of the specific written objections are subject to the page limitations found in LR 7-4.